REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, and 5-10 are pending and under consideration. No new matter is presented in this Amendment.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

Claims 1, 3, and 5-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Lamkin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,178,106). The applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 recites, in part, "prohibiting...the AV playback engine from being informed of the occurrence of the key input event. In maintaining the rejection, the Examiner construes the second event recited in claim 1 as corresponding to when the video is not playing in a full-screen mode. When the video is not playing in the full-screen mode Lamkin discloses that the navigation buttons do not work for DVD navigation (col. 19, lines 51-54). The Examiner construes the DVD navigator 422 as corresponding to the AV playback event, and construes the embedded web browser 410 as corresponding to the ENAV engine.

In order for a prior art reference to anticipate a claim, each and every element must be found in the prior art reference, whether expressly or inherently. MPEP § 2131 (citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)) Lamkin, however, does not expressly disclose <u>how</u> the navigation buttons do not work for DVD navigation. Claim 1 recites that the AV playback engine is prohibited from being <u>informed</u> of the occurrence of the key input event when a second event occurs. Lamkin, on the other hand, merely discloses that the navigation buttons do not work for DVD navigation, without disclosing how this functionality is to be expressed.

Lamkin strongly suggests that the DVD navigator 422 will be "informed" of the navigation commands from the user remote control 730, but will not <u>act</u> upon those commands if the DVD navigator 422 determines that the video is not playing in a full-screen mode. Lamkin expressly discloses that input from the user remote control 730 is received by the DVD navigator 422 (shown by the arrow in FIG. 7; see also col. 11, lines 37-39, "). There is no component between the DVD navigator 422 and the user remote control 730 to prevent input from the user remote control 730 from being received by the DVD navigator 422. Lamkin does not disclose any mechanism by which the DVD navigation will not receive, and therefore not be informed of, the navigation commands from the user remote control 730. This indicates that the DVD navigator

422 will always be informed of key input events, such as key input events corresponding to the navigation buttons, even if the DVD navigator 422 subsequently determines not to act upon these events. Although it may be the case that a component would not receive a command and still be "informed" of the command, it is certainly true that a component that receives a command will also be "informed" of the command. Since the DVD navigator 422 will always receive key input events, as shown in FIG. 7, the DVD navigator will therefore always be <u>informed</u> of those key input events. Lamkin therefore does not disclose wherein the ENAV engine refrains from informing the AV playback engine of the occurrence of the key input event, as recited in claim 1.

In addition Lamkin also fails to disclose that the prohibiting occurs "when a second event occurs using second event information recorded in the markup document", as recited in claim 1. Lamkin discloses that the navigation buttons do not work for DVD navigation unless video is playing in full-screen mode. Lamkin does not indicate that this feature of the full-screen video mode is activated based on second event information recorded in the markup document. The disclosure in fact suggests that the button disabling feature will always be present during the full-screen video mode, not that the feature can be triggered based on second event information included in the markup document. Lamkin provides an extensive listing of commands that can be included in a markup document, but none of these commands corresponds to the navigation button disabling feature disclosed at col. 19, lines 51-54, and the Examiner has not identified any command corresponding to the button disabling feature. This clearly indicates that the button disabling feature is independent of the commands that can be included in the markup document. Lamkin thus does not disclose wherein the ENAV engine refrains from informing the AV playback engine of the occurrence of the key input event based on second event information recorded in the markup document. Accordingly, Lamkin does not disclose all the limitations of claim 1, and the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 7-10 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 3, 5, and 6 depend from claim 1. The rejection of claims 3, 5, and 6 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the

application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 12/31/08

By: Gregory L. Clinton
Registration No. 59,134

1400 Eye St., NW
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510